

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: July 24, 2003

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission
Shea Lubecke, Architectural Review Commission
Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission
Lisa McCauley, Acting Chair, Architectural Review Commission
John Patsey, Architectural Review Commission

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Planner

Call to Order

Chair Julian called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Roll Call

The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Shea Lubecke, present; Stephen Petersen, absent; Karen Plummer, present; John Patsey, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Mr. Petersen arrived at 7:38.

Old Business

ARC 02-35 O'Donnell Residence – 203 South Dundee Avenue (Preliminary Meeting, Historic)

Petitioner: Marty O'Donnell, John Eiffler, architect (223 W. Jackson, Chicago)

Ms. McCauley arrived at 7:40.

Mr. O'Donnell gave an introduction and passed out blueprints for his property. He said his intention is to open a bed & breakfast with 5 bedrooms & 5 baths in addition to his bedroom & bath. Asked for any questions.

Mr. Julian asked about changes to the style of the windows and doors.

Mr. O'Donnell said that the style of windows & doors are 1 over 1's and they intend to restore them to this style.

Ms. Lubecke noted that the property was large. She said the Board had some issue with the garage before.

Mr. O'Donnell said their intention was to provide off-street parking. The village was mandating 5 off-street parking but it doesn't completely function as 5 because there are 3 on one side, but the Village has approved the parking, which came out of the Bed and Breakfast Special Use Ordinance.

Ms. Lubecke stated that the elevations look well thought out, but that the pitch of the portico over the entry door looks steep.

Mr. Eiffler asked about how old the existing porch was. He said the front door, sidelights, etc., are from the teens. One change is that there is a concrete pad down to North

Ms. Lubecke stated that there is a 50 year guideline; prior to 50 years is considered historic change.

Ms. Lubecke asked if they would leave the material on the roof.

Mr. Eiffler said that the idea is to re-roof the entire building.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested to refer to photos. He said they will keep everything on front and sides of house w/ advice from village.

Mr. Coath asked about the existing construction.

Mr. O'Donnell said that it was concrete from the 50's or 60's and he thinks the original covered entry was probably wood. They want to return it to what they think it was originally.

Mr. Coath asked about the height of the French doors on the north elevation.

Mr. Eiffler said he thinks they are 8 feet and that they are trying to get the window and door heads to align. The idea is to try to get the brick to match the existing brick on the building.

Mr. Coath suggested using 7 foot doors to have a better scaled door.

Mr. Eiffler said they would be happy to do that.

Mr. Coath asked about the windows.

Mr. Eiffler stated that there is a new addition to the old building. The question is in the Secretary of Interior Guidelines about how different one should make the old from the new. He said that the width of the windows are similar to the existing.

Ms. Lubecke said they should work in a way to distinguish old from new.

Mr. Petersen commented on the mass of the building. He looks at how large it is going to be on Station Street and said that the petitioners have made an effort to diminish the addition on Station Street and push it back towards backyard, which helps keep the character of the old house. Mr. Petersen thinks that the house is lost because of the mass next to it. He suggests pushing the porch back and creating a courtyard between the two buildings, which would result in not such a massive appearance from Station Street.

Mr. Eiffler stated that they want to maintain as much of the exterior wall of the existing house as possible.

Mr. Petersen suggested putting bedrooms on the back and maybe stairs to the outside may help with the massing.

Mr. Eiffler said the issue is that they need privacy, so they pushed it Northward because of the South facing courtyard. This would help serve as an identity for the building.

Mr. Petersen said there would still be room if it was moved. He noted that they also have to think of the people that live around there and their concerns of a hotel-looking structure by them.

Mr. Eiffler said he would not call it a hotel-looking structure

Mr. Petersen said the scale bothers him and asked why they aren't matching more of the original house.

Mr. O'Donnell said the board did not want them to duplicate what they had.

Mr. Eiffler said they want the existing house to be taller and more prominent. He also commented that the windows at the top are meek, which helps the building feel more historic and the idea was for it to be a little smaller.

Mr. Julian asks if it is smaller.

Mr. O'Donnell says one section is narrower and gives measurements.

Mr. Julian asked if they were proposing brick for the addition and what about the existing middle section.

Mr. Eiffler said it is all wood for now.

Mr. Julian stated that the design looks better than he ever thought it would. He agrees with Petersen about the recession of the porch

Mr. Eiffler stated that the 1st floor is set about 2 feet back.

Mr. Julian asked if they could drop the Easternmost part lower?

Mr. Eiffler said they could.

Mr. Coath said he likes the solution and doesn't mind the porch. He thinks it is better to have the rooflines be different for greater distinction between old house and to protect it's identity. He stated that he is not sure about the windows in the box bay, which introduces a large jump in proportion.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed. He said there is a concern about falling out of the windowseat.

Mr. Coath said he thinks it would be worth it for the corner box bay to get a sense of visual support back to the original building because he personally thinks it is too contemporary not to have visual support beams.

Mr. Eiffler said this is an interesting issue. He thinks that throughout the country, whenever you add to an historic building you want to have the message that it is a new building. The addition should speak of the new rather than 1894.

Ms. Lubecke stated that we will always know there is an addition; you cannot duplicate it without knowing that.

Mr. Coath said his own opinion is to see a more sympathetic gesture towards the building.

Ms. McCauley said she likes it overall. She asked about the roofline and the box bay and whether it makes sense to separate that roofline from other roofline.

Mr. Eiffler said they have done it both ways. They have a sleeping porch with double hungs and they think the box bay should look different.

Ms. McCauley said she would vote for double hungs. She asked about one other part of the elevation that she does not understand: the way the box bay is drawn it looks like it is going towards the West, but it is not drawn that way in the plan. She stated that it looks like the box bay does not go beyond structure.

Mr. Eiffler said that is further back and the wall is the back of the receding area. There is a door that swings out where the building becomes a little narrower.

Ms. McCauley suggested that the roofline should align with the left side of the 3-line bay.

Mr. Eiffler said it is further East and shows on document.

Ms. McCauley said she likes the idea of the terrace going South and off of Station street for guests. On the South elevation, it showed definition of panel that forms under the windows of 2nd floor, which is not shown on the North elevation. Ms. McCauley stated it would be nice for them to be the same.

Mr. Eiffler agreed that should be consistent.

Ms. McCauley stated that the cornice detail on the North elevation above the 1st floor needs more.

Ms. Plummer had no additional comments.

Mr. Julian asked about how to break up the façade on the East elevation (3 car garage). He made a suggestion how to do that.

Mr. Sbiral stated there has not been a full zoning review because it is preliminary. He asked about the height of the building addition and told the petitioners to check it. Mr. Sbiral clarified the requirement as 8 stalls for parking. He stated that they had 3 stalls, 3 inside the garage, with 1 of them being tandem, which would be 7. Mr. Sbiral said to make sure they have a buffer on landscaping on the east side.

Mr. Sbiral asked for a consensus on investigating the mass of the Station Street elevation and to move the center section South by 6 feet. (Lubecke – yes, Petersen – yes, Plummer – yes, McCauley – yes, Coath – no, Julian – yes)

Mr. Petersen stated his concern about the long façade (80 feet). He said the issue is the mass of the building from Station Street compared to what is on the street now. He recommends the petitioners investigate the mass.

Mr. Sbiral stated that the scale should be considered on the Station Street elevation. He said that the box bay and casement window should also be investigated more and the proportion of the windows be reconsidered.

Ms. McCauley added to reconsider use of casement windows. All consented.

Mr. Sbiral asked for a consensus that the corner box bay should have some logical support. All consented.

Mr. Sbiral stated that on the South elevation, definition of the panel should be consistent with the North elevation and everyone agreed. Mr. Sbiral said the last point was Mr. Julian's final comment about breaking up the façade on the East elevation and everyone agreed.

Ms. Lubecke suggested reducing the height of doors instead of being 8 feet tall.

Ms. Plummer noted the recommendation for 7 foot doors w/ tran. above. Everyone consented.

Ms. Lubecke suggested a separate roofline over the sleeping porch instead of continuous mass.

Ms. McCauley said to add that to the 2nd item on the staff report.

Mr. Petersen suggested saying that the board wants the box bays to match.

Ms. McCauley asks for consensus on roofline on new structure to match. (Petersen- yes, Plummer- abstain, McCauley- no, Lubecke-yes, Coath- yes, Julian- yes)

Mr. Eiffler stated that he wanted to remind the board of the Glessner House in Chicago; that there is a reason for its size, etc. (because it creates a court). He thinks the request to move the building back will be a detriment to the building and would be unfortunate to change the connection of the 2 buildings.

Mr. Sbiral said he would send items in a letter to Eiffler and O'Donnell and they can decide what they will go with.

Petitioners exit meeting.

ARC 03-08 Bussanmas Residence – 628 South Grove Avenue (Public Hearing, Continuation)

Petitioners: Mark Bussanmas, 628 South Grove Avenue

Mr. Petersen recused himself

Motion to continue to August 28, 2003 at 7:30 pm made by Ms. McCauley and seconded by Ms. Lubecke.

Mr. Sbiral said the staff would typically recommend dropping the hearing because they haven't received any information but that there was no harm in continuing one more time.

Roll Call vote:

Lubecke – yes

Petersen – abstain

Patsey – absent

Plummer – yes

McCauley – no

Coath – yes

Julian – abstain

MOTION CARRIES 3-1

Mr. Petersen returned to the dais.

ARC 03-10 Fifth Third Bank – 333 West Northwest Highway (Final Meeting, Non-Historic)

Petitioners: Nancy Harbottle, Jeffrey Kutsche, Ted Carlson, Phil Bielawski , representatives Fifth Third Bank

Mr. Kutsche passed out documents and went through list of what is different. He said #2 was a request for a sample of divided light material and he showed sample. He stated it is wood and is applied to window.

Mr. Petersen asks if they caulk the edge.

Mr. Kutsche says it is removable.

Mr. Julian asks if they have the make and model of the window with them and how can they prove what they are using.

Mr. Kutche stated that he was only asked to bring a wood sample.

Mr. Julian said a problem the board always runs into is that there is not enough specificity.

Mr. Kutsche said it was not his intention to be deceptive. He confirmed that approval would be made at a later date.

Mr. Kutsche discussed the entry door, which the committee said at the last meeting did not have to be wood, but that they needed to make sure there is thick enough dimension. The top photo he showed represents windows of just about every bank around town and the middle photo is a copy of the doorframe they want to use. Mr. Kutsche passed the photos around.

Mr. Petersen asked if the bottom style should be heavier and stated that it needs to be 10 or 11 inches to meet guidelines.

Mr. Kutsche agrees that it will have that. Item #4 was reviewed at last meeting. Item #5 was to consider adding brackets to the shutters for an authentic look. Mr. Kutsche stated that he was reluctant to do that because of rust streaks from wear of weather and they have a tendency to twist or break off, which is a less attractive solution that he would prefer not to use. Item #6 was a request to make something larger on the West elevation (approx 25% larger). #7 was approved at last meeting. #8 was a request to investigate the porch. Mr. Kutsche said that the other drawing handed out shows the porch extended another foot. He also stated that his preference remains not to add a copper canopy because it is not consistent with any other materials. He stated that he brought samples of the roof and paint samples, which he showed to the board.

Mr. Petersen suggested they go through them one by one.

Mr. Kutsche told what the colors are. In natural light colors will be different.

Mr. Kutsche said #9 was the color, and #10 was signage that does conform to ordinance. The brick is Woodbury.

Mr. Sbiral said they had gone through the 10 points through previous ARC meetings, which were all resolved except couple highlighted here. The standards for the building are met. Color samples & windows in front façade are clear- staff recommends this be approved and moved to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Sbiral stated that the elevation handed out tonight will need to be turned into staff. The building plans should be attached to the resolution.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC consensus was that windows should be wood and a sample should be provided at final meeting.

Mr. Petersen stated that wood is not removable.

Mr. Kutsche said it was discussed at last meeting and he did not think it was what the board wanted, which is why they came back with a different solution.

Mr. Julian said it is an issue of the style of the windows versus the material.

Mr. Petersen said it is not true divided light to have mutton snap in and out but rather glued onto the glass.

Ms. Harbottle asked where there would be an example of this. She stated that they had looked at other buildings and they were the same style as presented here.

Mr. Kutsche says their dimension in width is the same as true divided light but is not through glass, it is applied. Their only question tonight is whether it is permanent application.

Mr. Petersen asked if it is on the interior or exterior.

Mr. Kutsche said interior.

Mr. Petersen said if they allow a snap-in, it is better to be on outside than inside.

Ms. Harbottle asked if it would be possible to do from the outside.

Ms. McCauley asked what the problem was with getting an SDL window.

Mr. Coath suggested getting a real window. Without much going on architecturally, there would be an obvious inauthenticity to the building.

Ms. Harbottle said it was a neo-traditional look and she does not personally believe that it will make a big difference.

Mr. Sbiral asked for a consensus to include a condition that the windows are simulated divided light wood windows with glued on mutton on the outside and the inside, or true divided light. Window must have final ARC approval prior to installation.

Mr. Petersen stated that he agreed with everything but that it does not have to be wood, it can be aluminum.

All members consented.

Mr. Sbiral said that in exhibit 1 (door sample) the middle photo door will be used but the bottom rail will be 10-11 inches to meet code. All consented. Mr. Sbiral noted that the color chosen was OC40 Benjamin Moore. All consented. All consented also that the brick is Woodbury. Mr. Sbiral brought up the issue of the shutters being able to cover the windows if they were closed.

Mr. Petersen said they should have the hardware to look like they would close, but not actually close.

Mr. Kutsche stated they were reluctant to put brackets on for various reasons.

Mr. Sbiral asked for a consensus that brackets be applied to shutters and approved by ARC prior to application. (Julian-yes, Petersen-yes, Lubecke- yes, Plummer- abstain, Ms. McCauley- yes, Coath- yes)

Mr. Sbiral asked if the revised cupola was adequate.

Ms. McCauley said it should be wider and lower. All members consented.

Ms. McCauley asked if cupola is prefabricated.

Mr. Kutsche stated they have a company that manufactures it and made a clarification that the one proposed is too high and they could go back to the original height but make it wider.

Ms. Harbottle asked what would be an acceptable dimension.

Ms. McCauley suggested pulling it down and making it 1 ½ times wider.

Mr. Sbiral asked for consensus on cupola being wider and shorter (1 ½ times wider with decreased base height of approx. 50%) and presented to ARC prior to construction. (Julian-yes, Petersen-no, Lubecke-no, Coath-yes, McCauley-yes, Plummer-yes)

Ms. Harbottle asked for measurements.

Mr. Sbiral said there were no measurements on drawings so he could not provide them. #7 was met at previous meeting. Item #8 was request that the porch come up further and that the petitioner consider the use of a copper canopy.

Mr. Kutsche stated they chose not to apply copper because it does not go with everything.

Consensus as presented without copper: Petersen- yes, Lubecke-yes, Julian-yes, Coath- no, McCauley-no,

Plummer-yes

Mr. Coath suggested that neck of column should be in line with canopy.

Mr. Kutsche said they would be fine with that.

Mr. Sbiral said that the neck or shaft of column should be in line with face of frieze. All consented. He stated that right now they have 8 conditions on petition and they want to see them back about the windows, brackets for shutters, and the cupola.

Mr. Coath suggests adding a crown to the raking cornice. All consented.

Commissioner Petersen moved to recommend approval of the proposed project to the Board of Trustees and to adopt the findings of fact in the staff report as the findings of fact of the Architectural Review Commission Subject to the following conditions:

1. In Exhibit 1 (7/24/03) the middle photograph of the door will be used, however, the bottom rail shall be 10-11 inches to meet building code.
2. The color scheme of the building trim shall be Albescent (OC40) Benjamin Moore Color paint.
3. The brick shall be Woodburry from Jenkins Brick company.
4. A Simulated Divided Light window with a glued on muntin shall be used. Alternatively, true divided light windows could be used. The window must have final ARC approval prior to installation. Aluminum clad windows are permitted in the B-1 Zoning District.
5. Brackets shall be applied to the shutters and require final approval by ARC prior to installation.
6. The cupola shall be wider and shorter and must be presented to the ARC prior to construction. The cupola shall be at least one and one-half times wider with a decreased height.
7. The neck of the column shall be in line with the face of the frieze.
8. A crown shall be added to the raking cornice on all elevations.

Commissioner McCauley seconded the motion.

A roll call noted Commissioner Plummer, aye; Commissioner Lubecke, aye; Commissioner Patsey, absent; and Vice-Chairperson Coath, aye; Commissioner Peterson, aye; Commissioner McCauley, aye; Chairperson Julian, aye. The motion was approved.

Mr. Sbiral told the petitioners to have all drawings in and have ARC inspection to make sure resolutions have been met. If you have any questions or changes during process, come back to ARC.

New Business

ARC 03-14 GK Development, 257 East Main Street (Public Meeting, Non-Historic)

Petitioners: Greg Kveton, Jack Otto

Mr. Kveton says basically they are proposing facade modification to building- non-structural, in final stages of negotiating lease with final tenant. They are trying to minimize contemporary lines to building and soften it.

Mr. Otto said they will try to open up the exterior of building. They are proposing to take out railings and put in more transparent metal railings, to help put a balance between the horizontal and vertical lines.

Ms. Lubecke asked if the trellis has glass.

Mr. Otto said no.

Ms. McCauley suggested picking up the color of the arches on the upper floor to be friendly to the new building.

Mr. Otto said it was gray and they are changing to beige and tan, warmer colors.

Ms. McCauley said it was a street-friendly elevation and she had no problems with the presentation.

Mr. Julian asked for them to explain the colors.

Mr. Otto said they would use a base color and do a wash of the 2nd color. He showed the documents. He stated that in recessed areas they would use different colors and they don't want to paint the brick because it is a warm color.

Ms. Lubecke said she would like to see a sample from a real finish, rather than the picture.

Mr. Otto said they are borrowing the colors from the project in the picture.

Ms. McCauley asked about bringing more greenery down to street level.

Mr. Otto said their intention was for pottery at the entrance.

Mr. Petersen stated that usually railings are planted and they look really nice.

Ms. Lubecke asked if it can be a flat roof.

Mr. Otto said it is sloped so you can see it, and it will add interest.

Mr. Kveton said the color is redwood.

Ms. Lubecke asked where the brownish tone goes.

Mr. Otto said it goes on the trim across top, arches, frame.

Ms. Lubecke thinks the color needs to be a little darker, more bronze.

Mr. Otto said the top picture is what they are borrowing the color from.

Ms. Plummer asked if they will gut the interior.

Mr. Kveton said the 2nd floor will be gutted.

Ms. Lubecke stated that if petitioners are trying to do color scheme in photo they are not quite there. The colors aren't quite what that palate is, and they will get different kind of building. She thinks the green needs to be more turquoise and the 2nd color needs to be either darker brown or maroon and that it is not bad to be less beige. She said varying degrees is something people do all the time. Ms. Lubecke also commented that the sloped roof over stairwell is distracting.

Mr. Otto said that the reason for it is that the floors are offset, and it is kind of at 2nd floor level.

Ms. Lubecke said she thinks they don't need to be exactly the same thing as other end. They could have a flat roof or they could think of something else all together. They could also have a glass structure.

Mr. Kveton asked if it would be objectionable if beams were smaller.

Ms. Lubecke said they should be smaller. She commented that on the back she doesn't understand why members are turned horizontally, because it does not seem to relate to rest of building. (over stairwell)
Ms. Lubecke said they have done 2 different ones and she didn't like either one.

Mr. Sbiral stated that the sloped roof over stairwell should be investigated.

Ms. Lubecke said she likes the idea of a trellis and she likes the South elevation.

Mr. Julian excused himself and Mr. Coath, Vice Chair, assumed the duties of the Chair.

Mr. Coath said he doesn't mind the lattice of the trellis. He would question the segmental arches and thinks that the building needs a terminus of some sort.

Mr. Otto said they would add verticals to break that off and put an arch element in there that may not be necessary.

Ms. McCauley agreed that the green needs to be revisited. No problem with direction going above stairwell. Suggests they study lighting.

Ms. Plummer had no additional comments.

Mr. Petersen excused himself.

Mr. Sbiral asked the board what they want for final hearing (material samples, colors). He told petitioners that the deadline is 3 weeks for submitting elevations to meeting.

Mr. Petersen returns.

Coath makes request for 2 minute break.

Coath reconvenes meeting.

ARC 03-15 Stevens Residence, 643 South Cook Street (Preliminary Meeting, Non-Historic)

Petitioners: Linda Grubb, architectural petitioner (102 N. Cook), Jared & Jeanie Stevens

Ms. Grubb asked if the board was familiar with the house and they said they were. She stated that the Stevenses bought the house and think it needs aesthetic help because it has been remodeled out of original character. Changes will be made in phases over the years because of budget. The only window to be changed will be picture window in front and they would like to make it a pair of double-hung windows. Ms. Grubb stated that the previous owners had built a detached garage 3 feet from back of house that makes it difficult to back in and out. The Stevenses want to take it down to make it more in keeping with the neighborhood. The windows are new and in good shape and they are willing to put in mutton to help the look of it.

Mr. Petersen said he is assuming the columns are round and asks if they have investigated anything else such as square columns. He stated that the house doesn't really have a style yet. Round columns give it a certain style, but rest of house does not go with that. He would rather not see muttons, but leave them the way it is. Applying something like that will look like it's applied.

Ms. Grubb said the roof pitch and everything is non-historic and they cannot make it something it's not.

Mr. Petersen said that detailing adds character, makes house look a little more substantial.

Ms. Grubb stated that they have added to the porch.

Mr. Petersen said the gable needs more orientation.

Ms. Grubb said that crowns will change the roof and they have no budget to do so.

Mr. Petersen said he wants to put things on it that will not give it a cheap, applied look. He doesn't know if the windows are capable of taking the depth of the muttons to look right. Because of the double hung there is only an 8 inch width.

Ms. Lubecke asked if they might keep certain elements in, like French doors.

Ms. Grubb said they are not getting true divided light.

Ms. Lubecke stated that a simple window is consistent and looks fine; sometimes simple is better. She feels the same way about the shutters.

Ms. Grubb said she agrees with that.

Mr. Sbiral asked to redirect the scope of what they are doing to help him put together the letter to the petitioner. He asked the board to frame comments in reference to 9. hh (only aspects that ARC looks at), 3 general categories- scale & form of structure, relation to street & streetscape.

Ms. Lubecke said that removing the shutters makes it more consistent with package and would not recommend adding SDLs because it would make it too busy.

Mr. Coath said the improvements are nice. He said he can see what they are suggesting with the mutton, but it might be better to stay away from snap in muttons but he will leave that up to them. He asked about the floor of the porch.

Ms. Grubb said the paving would be brick.

Mr. Coath commented on the diameter of the columns. He said simplification might be to hold diameter a little smaller.

Ms. McCauley said to make sure the porch is big enough. She would prefer square columns instead of round but that is the petitioners' decision. She asked if it would scale better to have 2 separate garage doors instead of one.

Ms. Grubb said the garage must go before ZBA because it is too tall.

Sbiral asked about the time frame on the garage.

Mr. and Ms. Stevens said hopefully construction would begin this year.

Mr. Sbiral said the staff has supported garage elevation.

Ms. Plummer had no additional comments.

Mr. Sbiral said he will summarize the items in a letter and reminded the petitioners of the 3 week deadline for submission (August 7).

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

Planner's Report

Mr. Sbiral said he is not sure he has anything for next meeting (1st one in August) because the ARC did not continue anything tonight and the deadline for submitting something for the meeting was today, so there might not be a meeting.

Mr. Sbiral said to mark calendars for October 9 Historic District meeting. It will be an all Barrington Village meeting about the historic district and the ARC will play role in that meeting, the Staff plays role, and it will also be public meeting. On the agenda will be a review of text amendment to historic district ordinance, which the staff has not done yet, but by that time they will have made recommendations for amendments. The meeting will address petitions for new historic districts, petitions for shrinking historic district, windows, siding, etc. Will be run by staff & then have open discussion. Says it will be televised live and then re-aired.

The ARC further discussed some things that will be addressed at the October 9, 2003 meeting. Mr. Sbiral said the meeting would bring to the public things like the result of not going to the ARC. He said they were hoping to get realtors, developers and residents to come to the meeting. They discussed some specific issues of properties in the area that will be addressed at the October 9, 2003 meeting.

Ms. Lubecke suggested watching an "Architectural History" program that investigates historic buildings because it shows that standards of housing here are not as bad as some other places.

Adjournment:

Ms. McCauley made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all yes.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Emerick, Recording Secretary

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission